UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,012	12/11/2006	Jorge Abellan Sevilla	526801-57PUS	6077

27799   7590   09/11/2007

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
551 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1210
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER
MAHMOOD, REZWANUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/561,012	ABELLAN SEVILLA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Rezwanul Mahmood	2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _m_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 December 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _12/15/2005_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-7 are pending in this office action.

Specification

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not follow the proper language and format for an abstract. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to **a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kruglikov (US Patent 6,505,215) in view of Guthery (US Patent 6,824,064).

5.   With respect to claim 1, Kruglikov discloses a method for synchronizing databases (DB1, DB2), a first database (DB1) being stored in a first data processing system (MOB), a second database (DB2) being stored in a second data processing system (MNO) (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Figure 1; Here data stored in the first data processing system is synchronized with the data stored in the second data processing system),

said method comprising:

a.   A loading step in which an application (APP) is loaded into said first data processing system (MOB) (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1);

b.   An execution step in which the application (APP) executes a command (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1);

c.   A requesting step which said command requests the first data processing system (MOB) to process a synchronization step, said command providing the first data processing system (MOB) with the information about the synchronization parameters to be used for synchronizing the content of the first (DB1) and the second (DB2) databases (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-

24; Figure 1),

Kruglikov does not explicitly disclose:

said first data processing system (MOB) includes a security token (CAR) controlled by an operator (OP) and in that said application (APP) is loaded into said security token (CAR) as claimed.

The Guthery reference, however, discloses claimed data processing system including a security token controlled by and operator and an application is loaded into the security token (Guthery: Abstract, lines 1-7; Column 2, lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Kruglikov with the teachings of Guthery to have a data processing system include a security token controlled by an operator and load an application into the security token to move the administration of simultaneous communication with multiple applications on a smart card onto the smart card itself (Guthery: Column 3, lines 19-22).

6.   With respect to claim 2, Kruglikov in view of Guthery discloses the method according to claim 1, characterized in that the information includes the identifier of the database (DB2) to be synchronized (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1).

7.   With respect to claim 3, Kruglikov in view of Guthery discloses the method

according to claim 1, characterized in that the information includes the synchronization

protocol to be used between the 1st and 2nd data processing systems (Kruglikov:

Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1).

8.   With respect to claim 4, Kruglikov in view of Guthery discloses the method

according to claim 1, characterized in that the information includes the identifier of the

first database (DB1) (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4,

lines 14-24; Figure 1).

9.   With respect to claim 5, Kruglikov in view of Guthery discloses the method

according to claim 1, characterized in that the first data processing system (MOB) is a

mobile apparatus coupled to a smart card (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2,

lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1; Guthery: Abstract, lines 1-7; Column 2,

lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35).

10.   With respect to claim 6, Kruglikov in view of Guthery discloses the method

according to claim 1, characterized in that the application is informed of the

synchronization result between the 1st and 2nd databases (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-

15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1; Guthery: Abstract, lines 1-7;

Column 2, lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35).

11.   With respect to claim 7, Kruglikov in view of Guthery discloses the method

according to claim 1, characterized in that the application is informed of the

synchronization result if this was requested in the command (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines

1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1; Guthery: Abstract, lines 1-

7; Column 2, lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Rezwanul Mahmood whose telephone number is

(571)272-5625. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 10 A.M. - 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rezwanul Mahmood
Examiner
Art Unit 2164

August 23, 2007

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER